

### **Remarks/Arguments**

In the non-final Office Action dated February 19, 2008, it is noted that claims 1-11 are pending; that objection has been raised with respect to the specification; that claims 4 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112; that claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101; that claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e); that claims 4 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103; that the claim of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119 has been acknowledged; and that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

By this response, claim 11 has been amended to change the claim format into a Beauregard format. The specification has been amended to delete certain references to specific claims. The specification has also been amended in numerous locations to correct the typographical error “collusion(s)” to read as “collision(s)”. No new matter has been added.

### ***Objection to the Specification***

Objections have been raised with respect to certain portions of the specification on pages 2 through 4. As shown above, all references to specific claims in the body of the specification have been deleted therefrom and certain grammatical changes have been made to improve the readability of those sentences where the claim reference was deleted. These amendments are believed to be proper and justified. No new matter has been added. The amendments are believed to obviate the grounds of objection to the specification. Withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

### ***Rejection of Claims 4, 7-9, 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112***

Claims 4 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The probe-response mechanism is illustrated in Figure 10 and discussed in the specification beginning at page 12 in the section entitled, “*Synchronization via probe/probe response*”. [Emphasis supplied]. The probe response is also briefly illustrated in Figure 11 with a discussion beginning at page 13, line 16. Probe/probe signaling has also been discussed at page 3, lines 2-6. It is clear from these cited portions of the present application that the claimed limitation refers specifically to the signaling of a probe request message to all the stations of a subnet followed by a response to the probe request message.

For all the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that claims 4 and 8 are clear and definite. It is believed that claims 4 and 8 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §112. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

***Rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §101***

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claim 11 has been rewritten into a Beauregard format. Amended claim 11 now recites the following preamble:

*A machine readable medium having stored thereon machine executable instructions that, when executed, implement a method for operating a bridge terminal of a communication network for connecting a first subnet and a second subnet, wherein ....*

In view of the amendment to claim 11, it is submitted that the claim recites statutory subject matter. It is believed that this claim is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §101. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

***Rejection of Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102***

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,816,502 to Ekl et al. (hereinafter “*Ekl*”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 5, 9, and 11 are independent method claims. Claims 2-4 depend ultimately from claim 1; claims 6-8 depend directly from claim 5; and claim 10 depends from claim 9.

The rejection of claims 4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102 is improper and should be withdrawn because it fails to state a *prima facie* case of anticipation with respect to these claims. No detailed basis is specifically cited for the rejection of these claims. Moreover, there is no explanatory paragraph directed specifically to either claim 4 or to claim 8 in the section of the Office Action dealing directly with the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4 and 8 is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 calls, in part, for, “signalling the unavailability of the bridge terminal by means of a power saving signal of the communication network.” Claims 5, 9, and 11 include a substantially identical limitation to the one shown above for independent claim 1. In view of this similarity, the following remarks will be focussed on claim 1 and will be understood to pertain with equal weight to independent claims 5, 9, and 11.

Ekl appears to teach that first and second sets of parameters are communicated from an access point (AP) to a particular group of users or mobile stations (MS). The occurrence of

those parameter sets is used to indicate that the group aggregate communication time is beginning and that the group aggregate communication time is ending for the particular group of users. *See Ekl at col. 2, lines 24-35.* At col. 2, lines 55-67, Ekl appears to explain that a first timer is set in the AP to measure the group aggregate communication time and a second timer is set in the AP to measure the single group communication time. Both timers appear to be set when the first set of parameters is transmitted by the AP. At col. 3, lines 60-63, Ekl makes it clear that, at the expiration of the second timer, the AP ceases communications with the current set of users and begins communication with a new set of users. When the first timer expires, Ekl appears to state that communications with all the groups must be completed and that the AP then enters a sleep mode. *See Ekl at col. 4, lines 6-18.*

Ekl does not teach, show, or suggest that, “signalling the unavailability of the bridge terminal by means of a power saving signal of the communication network”, as defined in the claims. While Ekl discusses sets of parameters being exchanged in communications between the AP and the users or MSs, there is not even a remote suggestion by Ekl that the AP should communicate a power saving signal to the network to indicate the unavailability of the AP (bridge terminal). Instead, Ekl appears to rely solely on the expiration of a timer to cause the AP to go into a sleep mode. It is only by the action of an expiring timer that the network becomes aware of the unavailability of its AP. Nowhere is it suggested that the network becomes aware of the unavailability of the AP (bridge terminal) because the unavailability has been signaled to the network by means of a power saving signal.

In light of these remarks, it is believed that Ekl does not anticipate or make obvious claims 1-11. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-11 are allowable under both 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

***Rejection of Claims 4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103***

Claims 4 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Ekl in view of admitted prior art. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 depends directly from claim 1; claim 8 depend directly from claim 5.

The admitted prior art does not cure the deficiencies in Ekl discussed above with respect to the independent base claims. Therefore, the combination of Ekl with the admitted prior art does not teach, show, or suggest all the elements in claim 4 dependent from claim 1 and claim 8 dependent from claim 5.

In light of these remarks and the patentable distinctions discussed above with respect to the independent claims, it is believed that claims 4 and 8 would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art upon a reading of Ekl and the admitted prior art, either separately or in combination. Thus, it is submitted that claims 4 and 8 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

***Conclusion***

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

In the event there are any errors with respect to the fees for this response or any other papers related to this response, the Director is hereby given permission to charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian S. Myers/

By: Brian Myers

Registration No.: 46,947

For: Larry Liberchuk

Registration No.: 40,352

**Mail all correspondence to:**

Larry Liberchuk, Registration No. 40,352  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
May 19, 2008